Highway State Special Revenue, Non-Restricted Fund Balance (er	ial Rev	/enue, No	n-Re	estricted Fund	d Ba		g ba	ding balances)	
		FY08		FY09		FY10		FY11	FY12
Highway State Special Revenue Fund, Non-									
Restricted (02349)	<del>∽</del>	151,745.95	€9	151,745.95 \$ 1,128,640.08 \$ 1,150,532.22	↔	1,150,532.22	↔	(447,364.25) \$	105,288.74

Breakdown of number of employees receiving pay adjustments:	iving pay adjustr	men	its:	
			annualized	
			amount of	average amount
FY12:	# of pay changes		changes	of change
employees earning \$50,000 or more:	249	\$	270,710	\$ 1,087
employees earning less than \$50,000:	585	\$	2,134,083	\$ 3,648
TOTAL	834	\$	2,404,793	\$ 2,883

# Contracted individuals earning a state pension

Our research was only able to identify 1 individual but our systems don't capture this information so it is possible that there are more.

# MDT HB2 Vacancy Savings By Program

Budget	Spent	Remaining*	Vacancy Savings Rate**
12,612,767	12,228,349	110,980	0.88%
1 12,816,901	11,910,937	640,530	5.00%
13,677,412	11,598,459	1,865,150	13.64%
1	1 12,816,901	1 12,816,901 11,910,937	1 12,816,901 11,910,937 640,530

# Construction

2010	62,033,934	55,030,259	7,003,675	11.29%
2011	62,653,653	58,265,307	4,388,346	7.00%
2012	65,846,236	63,336,876	2,509,360	3.81%
			-,,	J.01/0

# Maintenance

2010	46,980,498	45,086,804	1,893,694	4.03%
2011	49,214,309	47,911,540	1,302,769	2.65%
2012	48,005,102	45,878,457	2,126,645	4.43%

## **MCS**

2010	7,320,051	7,295,561	24,490	0.33%
2011	7.404.544			0.5570
2011	7,494,514	7,329,319	165,195	2.20%
2042				2.20/0
2012	7,528,639	7,140,167	388,472	5.16%

## Aero

2010	631,890	627,839	4,051	0.64%
2011	586,421	582,221	4,200	0.72%
2012	643,902	627,811	16,091	2.50%

# **Planning**

2010	7,174,473	7,132,211	42,262	0.59%
2011	7,096,744	7,041,092	55,652	0.78%
2012	7,253,996	7,083,187	170,809	2.35%

# **Total MDT**

2010	136,753,613	127,401,023	9,079,152	E C 40/
2011	139,862,542	133,040,416	6,556,692	6.64% 4.69%
2012	142,955,287	135,664,957	7,076,527	4.95%

<sup>\*</sup> Vacancy Savings Rate does not include the Legislative Vacancy Savings already taken out of the budget. Note: HB2 does not include the Programs with Proprietary Funding (Equipment & Motor Pool)

# MDT FTE Utilization

(Based on 5-year average of 2008-2012)

	Construction Program	Maintenance Program	All Other MDT Programs	Total
Authorized FTE*	954.44	766.07	539.31	2,259.82
Vacant FTE	88.00	69.18	40.73	197.91
Vacancy Savings (VS) Requirement	38.18	30.64	21.57	90.39
Vacant FTE over VS requirement	49.82	38.54	19.16	107.52

### **Construction Program**

MDT's commitment is to have adequate resources available to fully deliver the federal aid construction program. As a part of that commitment, it is critical to have positions available to the department to remain flexible to the constantly evolving and fluctuating federal aid program. As an example, when the department needed to deliver the 220 million it received in ARRA funds, we asked for no additional FTE but rather utilized the ones we already had. This flexibility is also needed to react to the geographical diversity of project locations. If projects are located in more remote locations it is more cost effective to hire additional positions and run shifts than to pay overtime to fewer positions.

### Maintenance Program

Permanent full time employees are the first defense against winter storms and emergency situations. These employees are supplemented by approximately 250 seasonal employees that are hired on a part-time or on-call basis and are only utilized as needed for after-hours response or during severe storm events. This practice has enabled MDT to respond quickly and appropriately to such events. As the utilization of these additional employees is dependent on weather events, many of them may not be called often or at all during the season, thus leaving the FTE and associated budget authority "on the table." Not having these would mean that the department would either need to hire additional full time employees that may or may not have work to do or sacrifice service to the traveling public during winter storms. As an example, during the severe winter of 2010 and the floods of 2011, the department was able to tap into this pool of seasonal employees to respond quickly and appropriately not only to the needs of the state infrastructure but also to many of the counties in the state who were not resourced to respond themselves.

### All Other MDT Programs

Additional vacancies in other MDT programs primarily occur for three reasons:

- Some positions (i.e. some technology positions, MCS officers) have been difficult to recruit, resulting in unused FTE. (This is also the case for Construction and Maintenance positions, especially in Eastern Montana)
- 2) Many of the successful candidates for these positions are internal applicants, causing a "domino effect" of vacancies.
- 3) Like the construction program, many of the support functions of the agency need to have positions available to remain flexible to the constantly evolving and fluctuating federal aid program.

Any unspent funds due to vacant positions are available for future appropriation by the legislature.